

November 24, 2003

Ms. Pamela Smith
Assistant General Counsel
Texas Department of Public Safety
P.O. Box 4087
Austin, Texas 78773-0001

OR2003-8456

Dear Ms. Smith:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 191544.

The Texas Department of Public Safety ("DPS") received a request for six categories of information relating to bids for a particular requisition number. We note that you have released some of the requested information. You claim that third party interests may be implicated by this request, but you take no position on whether the remaining information is excepted from disclosure. We also note that you have submitted correspondence indicating that you have notified Greenlight Solutions, Ltd., RFD & Associates ("RFD"), Fleetware, Inc., MCCR, Inc., Psion Telogix, and Lockwood Technology, the third parties whose information is at issue in the current request, pursuant to section 552.305 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305 (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining that statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in Public Information Act in certain circumstances). RFD has responded to the notice. We have reviewed the submitted information.

An interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice under section 552.305(d) to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should be withheld from public disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have not received arguments for withholding the requested information from any of the remaining third parties whose information is at issue here. We thus have no basis for concluding that any of those parties'

information is protected proprietary information. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (stating that business enterprise that claims exception for commercial or financial information under Gov't Code § 552.110(b) must show by specific factual evidence that release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm); 552 at 5 (1990) (stating that if governmental body takes no position, attorney general will grant exception to disclosure under statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.110(a) if third party makes *prima facie* case that information qualifies as trade secret under section 757 of Restatement of Torts, and no argument is presented that rebuts claim as matter of law).

We note that some of the submitted information has been designated as confidential. However, information is not confidential under the Public Information Act (the "Act") simply because the party submitting the information anticipates or requests that it be kept confidential. *Industrial Found. v. Texas Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 677 (Tex. 1976). In other words, a governmental body cannot, through an agreement or contract, overrule or repeal provisions of the Act. Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987); Open Records Decision No. 541 at 3 (1990) ("[T]he obligations of a governmental body under [the predecessor to the Act] cannot be compromised simply by its decision to enter into a contract."). Consequently, unless the information at issue falls within an exception to disclosure, it must be released, notwithstanding any agreement specifying otherwise.

We now turn to RFD's arguments. RFD claims that the submitted information relating to RFD is excepted from disclosure pursuant to section 552.104 of the Government Code. We note, however, that section 552.104 is not designed to protect the interests of private parties that submit information to a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 592 at 8-9 (1991). Section 552.104 excepts information from disclosure if a governmental body demonstrates that the release of the information would cause potential specific harm to its interests in a particular competitive situation. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 593 at 2 (1991), 463 (1987), 453 at 3 (1986). We note that DPS has not argued that the release of any portion of the submitted information would harm its interests in a particular competitive situation under section 552.104. Accordingly, we conclude that DPS may not withhold any portion of RFD's information under section 552.104 of the Government Code.

With regard to section 552.110, RFD argues that portions of its information are excepted under the commercial or financial branch of section 552.110. Section 552.110(b) requires the business enterprise whose information is at issue to make a specific factual or evidentiary showing, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that substantial competitive injury would result from disclosure. *See* Open Records Decision No. 661 (1999). Upon careful review of RFD's arguments and information, we conclude that RFD has demonstrated that release of the information we have marked would result in substantial competitive harm. Therefore, DPS must withhold those portions of RFD's proposal that we have marked. However, we conclude that RFD has not demonstrated how release of the remainder of its information would result in substantial competitive harm. *See* Open Records Decision No. 509 at 5 (1988) (stating because costs, bid specifications, and circumstances will change for future contracts, argument that competitor could obtain unfair advantage on future contracts is

entirely too speculative to serve as basis for withholding information), 319 at 3 (1982) (stating that statutory predecessor to section 552.110 ordinarily does not protect information relating to organization and personnel, market studies, professional references, qualifications and experience, and pricing). Therefore, the remaining information is not excepted from required public disclosure by section 552.110 of the Government Code.

We note that some of the submitted information not otherwise protected by section 552.110 is protected by copyright. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.* If a member of the public wishes to make copies of copyrighted materials, the person must do so unassisted by the governmental body. In making copies, the member of the public assumes the duty of compliance with the copyright law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit. *See* Open Records Decision No. 550 (1990). You must release the submitted information in compliance with federal copyright law.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).


If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Jennifer E. Berry
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JEB/sdk

Ref: ID# 191544

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Mr. Tanner Jay
Capitol Associates of the Southwest
P.O. Box 143743
Austin, Texas 78714-3743
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. M'Lou Parron Bell
Munsch Hardt Kopf & Harr, P.C.
600 Congress Avenue, Suite 2900
Austin, Texas 78701-2978
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Angela Zamora
Greenlight Solutions, Ltd. Co.
9100 Westminster Glen Avenue
Austin, Texas 78730
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Ray Talwar
Fleetware, Inc.
7100 Woodbine Avenue, Suite 320
Markham, ON, Canada L3R 5J2
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. David Lawson
MCCR, Inc.
1720 Regal Row, Suite 117
Dallas, Texas 75235
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Don Adams
Psion Teklogix
1810 Airport Exchange Boulevard, Suite 500
Erlanger, Kentucky 41018
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Brad Vinecombe
Lockwood Technology
One Crosswood Path Boulevard
Merrimack, New Hampshire 030541
(w/o enclosures)